

### ***REMARKS***

In the November 12, 2008 Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 15-17 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claims 10-14, 20, and 21 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

### ***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the November 12, 2008 Office Action, Applicants have amended claim 1 as indicated above. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-17, 20, and 21 are pending, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

### ***Interview Summary***

On February 4, 2009, the undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Kosanovic and Supervisory Examiner McAllister, who are in charge of the above-identified patent application. Applicants wish to thank Examiners Kosanovic and McAllister for the opportunity to discuss the above-identified patent application during the Interview of February 4, 2009.

### ***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0189274, hereinafter referred as "Lee"). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to define the present invention over the prior art of record.

In particular, independent claim 1 now recites that an indoor unit of an air conditioner that requires a power transmission shaft for transmitting the driving force from the drive portion to the first opening and closing mechanism and the second opening and closing mechanism so that the first opening and closing mechanism and the second opening and closing mechanism perform in synchronization. Applicants respectfully assert that this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by Lee or any other prior art of record.

Specifically, the Lee publication discloses *two* transmission shafts for transmitting the driving force and that each transmission shaft transmits the driving force independently of each other. In this case, one shaft transmits the driving force to one mechanism and, there are

**two identical** mechanisms. In contrast to the Lee device, the indoor unit of an air conditioner of claim 1 of the present application has *one* power transmission shaft and *the driving force is transmitted to the first and second opening and closing mechanisms in synchronization*. In this case, *one* power transmission shaft transmits the driving force to **two different** mechanisms simultaneously. Applicants respectfully assert that Lee *fails* to disclose or suggest this unique arrangement.

It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, and 15-17 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, and 15-17 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 1, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 10-14, 20, and 21 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application.

Appl. No. 10/573,042  
Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008  
Amendment dated February 9, 2009

*Conclusion*

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-17, 20, and 21 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Yoshiko Sugahara /  
Yoshiko Sugahara  
Limited Recognition No. L0395

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: February 9, 2009

S:\02-FEB09-YS\DK-US030515 Amendment-after-final.doc